The University of Chicago

JAMES SHIRLEY'S *THE MAID'S REVENGE* ITS EDITING AND COMPOSITION

PART OF THE INTRODUCTION TO AN EDITION OF THE OLD PLAY

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
AUGUST, 1940

By
ALBERT HOWARD CARTER

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1943

The University of Chicago

JAMES SHIRLEY'S *THE MAID'S REVENGE* ITS EDITING AND COMPOSITION

PART OF THE INTRODUCTION TO AN EDITION OF THE OLD PLAY

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
AUGUST, 1940

BY
ALBERT HOWARD CARTER

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1943

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Editions.

1. Quarto.

The maid's revenge was first published either in 1639, or as I believe, in 1640.[1] In every respect this edition is a normal seventeenth-century quarto of a play. It was regularly entered on the Stationers' Register thus:

> 12° Apr' 1639.
> Will: Cooke. Entred for his Copie vnder the hands of m^r Wykes & m^r Mead warden a play called The Maides Revenge. by Ia: Shirley vj^d [D437][2]

The quarto duly appeared with the title-page:

> THE / MAIDES / REVENGE. / A TRAGEDY. / As it hath beene Acted with good / Applause at the private house in Drury / Lane, by her Majesties Servants. / [rule] / Written by IAMES SHIRLEY Gent. / [rule] / [ornament] / [rule] / LONDON. / Printed by T. C. for William Cooke, and are to be / sold at his shop at Furnivalls Inne Gate in / Holbourne. 1639.

Along with this appeared another issue with the imprint

> Printed for William Cooke, and are to be sold / at his shop at Furnivalls Inne Gate in / Holbourne. 1639.[3]

---

[1] For evidence in support of this theory, see notes on p. 1, l. 16 and p. 4, ll. 4-22.

[2] W. W. Greg, A bibliography of the English printed drama to the restoration, Vol. I, Stationers' Records. Plays to 1616: Nos. 1-349 ("Illustrated monographs issued by the Bibliographical Society," No. XXIV, pt. 1; London: for the Bibliographical Society, 1939), p. 50.

[3] Hazlitt notices a copy reading "Seruants"; cf. W. Carew Hazlitt, Collections and notes 1867-1876 (London: Reeves and Turner, 1876), p. 385. Unfortunately this part of the title-page is omitted in Hazlitt's Hand-book to the popular, poetical, and dramatic literature of Great Britain. . . . (London: Smith, 1867), p. 555. All other copies noticed in auction records agree with the collation as given.

The collation is: Quarto, A (one half-sheet, two leaves) + B to I (eight sheets, each of four leaves); consisting of [A1]^{r}, title-page as above; [A1]^{v}, "The Actors names"; A2^{r}, dedication "TO THE WORTHILY Honoured, Henry Osborne Esquire." signed "IAMES SHIRLEY."; A2^{v}, "A Catalogue of such things as hath beene Published by James Shirley Gent."; B1^{r}, head-title "THE MAIDES REVENG." and beginning of text; B1^{v}-[I4]^{r} text continued; [I4]^{v}, text concluded and "FINIS." A1 is unsigned, but all other gatherings are signed like B: B, B2, B3. A head-piece and a tail-piece are found on [A1]^{v}, a head-piece on A2^{r}, and a head-piece and tail-piece on A2^{v}.[4] Two kinds of ornamental initial 'T' are found, one in the dedication (A2^{r}), and one in the first word of the play (B1^{r}). The running-head "The Maides Revenge." appears (with a few slight variations in letters and pointing) on every page from B1^{v} to [I4]^{v}. Many of the running-heads were apparently set up once and then transferred from one forme to the next. For example, the running-head with an oversized 'M' which appears on p. 8 seems to me to have been from the same setting of type as that which appears on pp. 20, 36, 44; this group may even be identical with that which includes pp. 18, 52, 58, 68; another group has a comma: pp. 11, 22, 38, 56; and there are three groups with swash 'M''s: pp. 15, 45, 55, 61; pp. 24, 30, 46, 62; pp. 28, 34, 50, 66. The pages are not numbered in the Q.

Furthermore, the ten copies of the play which I have examined have variants usually found in such quartos: dropped letters and stop-press corrections. Below is a table of those formes in which variants appear. (For an explanation of the abbreviated names of the quartos see p. xxii. The sign 'c' means that on the

---

[4]For a description of these and their occurrence in some other seventeenth-century books, see notes on p. 1, l. 11; p. 5, l. 1.

forme named in the first vertical column, the quarto in question has the better reading, a reading either corrected during the printing or an originally good reading accidentally impaired in other copies. On formes not listed, I have found no variants.)

Quarto	C	Ca	CN	H	Hn	LC	Y	Bo	D	W	Total corrected
Sig. A outer	c		c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c[1]	9
inner	c		c	c	c	c	c	c[2]	c		8
B inner	c	c	c	c			c			c	7
C outer		c	c	c		c	c		c	c	7
inner		c	c	c		c	c	c	c	c	8
E outer[3]		c	c			c	c			c	5
F outer	c	c	c	c	c	c	c		c	c	9
G outer[4]	c	c	c	c	c	c	c		c	c	9
H outer		c	c	c			c			c[5]	4-5
I outer[6]	c		c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	9
Total corrected	6	8	10	9	5	8	10	5	7	8-9	
Total not corrected	4	2	0	1	5	2	0	5	3	2-1	

[1]W and Ca are different (in the variant imprint on the title-page), but Ca has a poorer reading (one that represents either the dropping out of a letter, or a press-correction; see p. 4, l. 17 and note on p. 1, ll. 14-16).

[2]There were perhaps two stages of correction on this forme; see note on p. 11, note on collation.

[3]The variants on this forme may be either accidental droppings of letters or actual corrections; see p. 29, note on collation.

[4]See p. 40, note on collation.

[5]There were two stages of correction on this forme; see p. 53, note on l. 9.

[6]There may have been two stages of correction on this forme, too; cf. note on p. 64, l. 36.

The ratio of good to poor readings not only on the separate formes but in the various copies is precisely what one should expect in representative seventeenth-century quartos made up of sheets corrected, uncorrected, and showing damage to the type during the course of printing. These variants also show no indication that the author read his own proof: there are no changes involving anything more than correction of spelling and punctuation, nothing whatsoever approaching revision; all could have been made by a copy-reader in the printer's establishment.

The quarto, moreover, though well printed, contains several of the kinds of errors constantly met with in seventeenth-century editions of plays. There are occasional turned letters, letters of the wrong fount, and words spaced incorrectly. The type-face is clear, but undistinguished; the type is Roman, of a body resembling modern pica (twenty lines to eighty-one millimeters). There are some peculiar individual types. For example, Cotes had an e with a mark above it; perhaps the printing house had a number of such types which had formerly been used to indicate 'en'; some he tried unsuccessfully to change, and these remained in the 'e' box.[5] Other peculiarities of type include the use, frequent but without meaning, of a black-letter period, several kinds of question marks (one of which is like black-letter and two of which are varieties of italic), Roman 'S' where an italic 'S' would have been expected, swash and unornamented italics used with no discrimination, and many faulty (i. e., damaged or poorly inked) points which give periods the appearance of small commas and colons the appearance of semicolons.

The lining of the verse is almost invariably accurate, though Gifford found a few passages which he felt justified in changing. But several speeches obviously in prose are printed in the quarto as verse. These are not difficult to detect, though they sometimes annoyingly contain whole lines that could be taken as loose verse.[6] But Cotes's treatment of prose and verse is no worse, perhaps even better, than that of most seventeenth-century printers.

---

[5]Professor Tucker Brooke, who was kind enough to examine the quarto with me, thinks such a possibility likely.

[6]Cf. my discussion of Gifford's treatment of these passages, p. xiii, and the notes to the individual passages.

The punctuation of the quarto, though different from twentieth-century usage, seems to me normal for the seventeenth century. Because statistical studies of the practices of various printing houses have not been made, I cannot, by classifying the several uses that I have found, show in detail the exact relationship between the system of punctuation in this play and those in other seventeenth-century plays, whether printed by Cotes or by his contemporaries. But the general practice of this quarto is very much like that which Simpson observed in the first folio of Shakespeare.[7] Thus, the pointing throughout is in general much lighter than it is today. In a sampling of one page of the text of the play from both inner and outer formes of every gathering, I have found one hundred and ninety-nine cases of the use of a comma between independent clauses where today we should demand a semicolon or a period.[8] Against this are only twenty-seven cases of a semicolon used within a speech; and here the mark usually shows a decided break in construction or in thought.[9] On these sixteen pages, moreover, a period occurs within a speech only four times.

A lighter punctuation is also used with introductory words, phrases, and clauses, and with vocatives and imperatives. Introductory words, phrases, and clauses are sometimes followed by commas, especially if the sentence is separated from a preceding independent clause by a comma.[10] But in many more cases such an

---

[7]See Percy Simpson, Shakesperian punctuation (Oxford: Clarendon, 1911), passim.

[8]Besides these cases, a colon occurs three times where the break in thought of structure is marked, and a semicolon is once used where we should use a summarizing dash.

[9]Elsewhere the semicolon is used, as it is today, where a comma would be expected were it not for other commas in the immediate context.

[10]Cf. for example p. 29, ll. 25-6: "But I must observe her, upon her fathers displeasure, / She is comitted to my Ladies custody."

introductory expression is followed by no punctuation. Introductory imperatives in all of five cases are not pointed, and though seven cases occur in which a vocative at the beginning of the sentence is followed by a comma, thirty-two have none. Vocatives in the middle of the sentence are in ten cases followed, but not preceded, by a comma, and in only one of thirty-six instances where the vocative comes before a mark of punctuation closing the clause does a comma precede the noun of address.

The usual speech-ending is a period, but, though four instances of the use of a comma may be misprints (the results either of foul case or of damage to the type-face), they ought to be noticed. Three speeches end in a dash, which by this time seems to have replaced (in Cotes's shop, at least) the semicolon, colon, or comma which Simpson observed as marking a broken speech in the first folio of Shakespeare.[11] Question marks, whether at the end of a speech or internally, are used in only (roughly) one half of the instances where we should use them today. Where they are omitted, the modern reader can invariably tell from the structure of the sentence that a question is meant. As in the first folio of Shakespeare, further, the query appears side by side with the exclamation mark to point an exclamation.[12]

The punctuation of non-restrictive adjectival clauses, of parenthetical expressions, and of adverbial constructions which interrupt the normal flow of the sentence is also somehwat light. But the practice of the quarto in these cases is usually the same

---

[11] Simpson, pars. 9, 28, 32, 36.

[12] Ibid., par. 37. It is often impossible to state how such exclamations were read; for this reason, when Q has 'Ha?,' and Gifford has 'Ha!,' the notes often point out that Gifford's interpretation is but one of two or more possibilities. Besides the query, I have noticed one case each of a comma and a period following such an exclamation in this count.

as contemporary practice. Sometimes it is even heavier than today. Thus, there are two cases of a comma before 'as,'[13] three of a comma before 'but' (i. e., 'except'),[14] and scattered instances of a comma before a complementary infinitive.[15] The quarto also uses commas heavily before 'and' in parallel constructions of all sorts and before clauses toward the end of the sentence.

Though I have been unable to make an exact statistical comparison of the practice of this quarto with others of the period, I have concluded that the twentieth-century reader of the play who has read Simpson and who can adapt himself to Cotes's[16] (perhaps even Shirley's) practice by close observation, will find little difficulty in understanding all but four or five lines of the text.

Thus, the first edition of Shirley's The maid's revenge, except for the existence of the variant imprint, is a quarto normal for its time. Some, but not many, interesting bibliological problems are connected with the printing. These are discussed in the notes, which also include facts about the date of the printing and about Cotes and Cooke.

2. The Edition of 1793.

The second edition of The maid's revenge appeared as a kind of supplement to The thespian magazine and literary repository. This periodical was established with the intention of giving impartial reviews of new performers and plays, of the graphic arts, of new books, and of new music. According to its

---

[13] Cf. Ibid., par. 16. [14] Ibid., par. 17.

[15] Cf. for example, p. 61, ll. 36-7: "had he laid on me / Command, to have mingled with his sacred dust"; p. 62, ll. 10-1: "I have no power nor greatnesse in the Court, / To raise thee."

[16] It is noteworthy, I believe, that on formes which have passed through a corrector's hand, many of the corrections are of punctuation.

"Introduction," it was to give summaries of the month's and of the season's activity in the theatre; lives and memoirs of artists, poets, and players; the history of the stage, including critiques of ancient authors; green-room secrets; notable occasional verse: prologues, epilogues, songs, and the like; portraits of authors, actors, and painters, and plans of theatres or famous buildings; and letters from contributors.[17] But more important to our purposes was its desire to reprint old plays:

> The first inducement to this work, was to snatch from oblivion the scarce and valuable writings of our ancient authors, as certainly it would be a pity, when the names of Heywood, Shirley, and others will never die, that their works should not also live: being in possession of several of their scarcest plays already, we flatter ourselves that we shall in time, be adequate to the task.[18]

The editors continue:

> As soon a[s] possible, we shall begin with the works of Shirley, Heywood, &c. &c. having already several of their most valuable plays in our possession, and meaning to spare no expence to procure the remainder.[19]

The atheists tragedy and Love's mistress having appeared in 1792 and The royal master in 1793, The maid's revenge was duly published with the title-page:

> THE / MAID'S REVENGE. / A / TRAGEDY. / Written by JAMES SHIRLEY, Gentleman. / [ornament] / [rule] / LONDON. / PRINTED 1639, RE-PRINTED 1793, BY / T WILKINS, ALDERMANBURY.[20]

---

[17] "Introduction," The thespian magazine and literary repository, I ([1792]-1793), iii-viii.

[18] Ibid., pp. ii-iii. [19] Ibid., p. vii.

[20] In the two copies I have examined (in the University of Chicago Libraries and Harvard University Library), this is bound with the second volume (June, 1792-November, 1793).

The collation of the Chicago copy expressed formally is: Octavo, A + C-G (six half-sheets, four leaves) + H (one sheet, eight leaves) + [H9] (one quarter-sheet, one leaf) + one leaf wanting; consisting of $[A1]^r$, title-page as above; $[A1]^v$, "DRAMATIS PERSONAE."; $A2^r$, head-title "THE MAID'S REVENGE." and beginning of text; $A2^v$-$[H9]^r$, text continued; $[H9]^v$ text concluded and "FINIS." The following leaves are signed: A2, C, C2, D, D2, E, F, F2, F3, G, G2, G3, H, H2, H3, H4. The running-head "THE MAID'S REVENGE." appears on every page from p. 4 to p. 46. The pages are numbered from p. 4 to p. 46.

As worthy as the desire to preserve the old plays from oblivion were the principles of editing implied in the "Introduction":

> The first play which we have deemed proper to begin with, is one of Tourneur's, who is author only of two, one of which, The Revengers Tragedy, Dodsley has given in his collection of old plays, (as he was not able to procure the other.) This gentleman having modernized the orthography of that, we have followed the example, faithfully adhering to the original stile and language, which it is our intention to preserve throughout.[21]

Unfortunately, between these principles and the publishing of the text something intervened: The maid's revenge of 1793 is carelessly printed. Though it never goes so far as to omit whole lines or important stage directions, its spelling is a curious mixture of seventeenth- and late eighteenth-century usage, the punctuation is often inconsistent with either Caroline or Georgian practice, misprints (including the omission of words) abound, and misreadings of the quarto are frequent. But an occasional alteration offers an interesting, and once or twice, an acceptable, emendation.

3. Gifford's Edition of 1833.

At his death in 1826, William Gifford, whose editions of Massinger, Jonson, and Ford were standard for nearly a century, left thirty-two of Shirley's plays edited and ready for publication.[22] Six years later, Reverend Alexander Dyce brought out the complete works:

> The dramatic works and poems of James Shirley, now first collected; with notes by the late William Gifford, Esq. and additional notes, and some account of Shirley and his writings, by the Rev. Alexander Dyce. In six volumes. . . . London: John Murray, Albemarle street. MDCCCXXXIII.

The second play of the first volume is The maid's revenge (pp. [99]-185).

---

[21] "Introduction," The thespian magazine, p. vii.

[22] Dyce, in the preface to the edition of 1833.

Though the modern reader familiar with seventeenth-century editions is constantly annoyed by Gifford's treatment of his text, once such a reader grants Gifford's method, he cannot but admit that Gifford was a sound editor. His purpose was to make a text for a nineteenth-century reader. Thus he divided the play into scenes. Seven of such changes in scene are necessitated by a marked change in action.[23] Four are justified only by Gifford's feeling that a new scene should begin whenever the stage is bare of speakers.[24] Four are questionable. Gifford imagined for the play a production on a stage with rapidly shifting scenery. Hence, ignoring the elasticity of the Jacobean stage, which would not require a new scene, Gifford added four.[25] Gifford also added for his readers descriptions of the various scenes. The quarto gives but one indication of the mise-en-scène.[26] For other such descriptions, Gifford had to rely on a careful reading of the text and his own imagination. In most cases he arrived at a justifiable conclusion.[27] The directions to the actor, Gifford also changed. The largest number of exits and entrances, he of necessity took from the quarto; in some cases (about half as many as those he accepted in the quarto), he changed somewhat the direction of the quarto; for example, stage-directions were commonly marked in

---

[23]Gifford, I, ii; II, iv; II, v; III, ii; III, iii; IV, ii; IV, iii.

[24]Gifford, II, iii; III, vi; V, ii; V, iii.

[25]Gifford, II, ii; III, iv; III, v; IV, iv.

[26]Cf. p. 34, ll. 12-14.

[27]Gifford, pp. [103], 105, 116, 127, 129, 132, 157, 165, 169, 174. Others were necessitated by his feeling that with a bare stage bare of characters the scene must change. Cf. note 3 above. Some he arrived at through convention (e.g., "A street," p. [103]), others through his extending hints in the text (thus the "Arbour," p. 17, l. 22 becomes "A Garden," p. 119). Some are purely arbitrary (e.g., "A Garden behind Vilarezo's House," p. 150).

seventeenth-century editions before the time when the action occurs to give the actor a warning; Gifford, making a text to be read, altered such directions justifiably. Gifford's unwarrantable changes I have discussed in the notes. Directions to the actor for stage business, Gifford also added; these are helpful, usually, to the casual reader, but unnecessary to the careful student. Again, errors on Gifford's part, I have discussed in the notes.

Gifford's contributions also include several emendations to the text. Like his thorough modernization of spelling and of punctuation and his expansion of contractions, these were more necessary to his audience than to the professional, scholarly audience of today. Though there is nothing to equal in brilliance Theobald's "a' babbled of green fields," many of Gifford's amendments are valuable even to a well-trained and imaginative reader today. And finally, his treatment of Shirley's verse is admirable. Though we disagree on some of his changes, though we take refuge in the belief that no matter what the author wrote, the actor (whether today or in Shirley's time) would make the final decision for a stage production, and though we know more about Shirley's versification and about Jacobean pronunciation than Gifford did, we are forced to praise his fine ear for verse. Gifford relined some of the quarto's faulty lines much to their improvement. An even greater service lies in his treating as prose the speeches of the comic characters, often lined like verse in the first edition. We may sometimes feel that his realignment is unnecessary, but we cannot but admit Gifford's good sense: the English language has a predominantly iambic stress, and English prose often contains lines of blank verse imbedded in it, especially if it is written by a man who writes largely in such verse.

Gifford's edition, then, though one may often take issue with it as I do in the notes, deserves the long acceptance that

it has enjoyed.

4. Lamb's Specimens.

In 1808, Charles Lamb saw published what was "in some respects its author's favourite book":[28]

> Specimens of English dramatic poets, who lived about the time of Shakspeare: with notes. By Charles Lamb. London: Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme, Paternoster-Row. 1808.[29]

In this work passages from The maid's revenge occupy pp. 459-469. Five years later the unsold sheets of this edition were bound together with a new title-page:[30]

> Specimens of English dramatic poets, who lived about the time of Shakspeare: with notes. By Charles Lamb. Second edition. London: printed for John Bumpus, near the gate, St John's square, by Hamblin and Seyfang, Garlick Hill, Thames Street. 1813.[31]

Another edition appeared twelve years later:

> Specimens of English dramatic poets, who lived about the time of Shakspeare. With notes. By Charles Lamb. A new edition. In two volumes. . . . .London: Edward Moxon, Dover Street. MDCCCXXXV.[32]

The passages from The Maid's revenge include pp. 119-130 of the second volume. Mr. Lucas, the latest editor of the selections, is of the opinion that Lamb read proof for this edition, and so counts it the most reliable of the three. But since there is no essential difference between the first two editions and the third in the parts of Lamb that I quote in my edition of the play, I have used

---

[28] E. V. Lucas (ed.), The works of Charles and Mary Lamb, Vol. IV, Dramatic specimens and the Garrick plays (London: Methuen, 1904), p. [v].

[29] From the copy in Harvard University Library.

[30] A ruler placed on any page of the text of The maid's revenge in the edition of 1808 connecting two periods, cuts through the same letters as a ruler so placed on the corresponding page in the edition of 1813. On this test cf. Ronald B. Mc Kerrow, An introduction to bibliography (Oxford: Clarendon, [1928]), p. 183.

[31] From the copy in the Newberry Library, Chicago.

[32] From the copy in the Newberry Library, Chicago.

the edition of 1808 (or 1813)—the one that Gifford might have used. Other editions followed in the nineteenth century and early twentieth century, but these I have considered of little value except for two, those of Gollancz[33] and of Lucas.[34]

Through this book, Lamb is credited with having revived the interest of the literary world in the great English drama of the Renaissance. But Lamb was far more than a popularizer; he was a sensitive critic. Though he gave only selections, those selections offer a kind of criticism. The maid's revenge he thought worthy of inclusion; it is the first play representing Shirley. The others are The politician, The brothers, and The lady of pleasure. Though modern critics with more texts available might alter this list considerably, few can quarrel with the passages that Lamb selected from them. From The maid's revenge he chose the first scene (pp. 5-7, l. 17), Vilarezo's welcome to Antonio (p. 11, l. 10- p. 12, l. 5), the arrival at Elvas and the challenge (p. 46, l. 24-p. 52, l. 21), and parts of Act V between Castabella and Sebastiano including his death (p. 61, l. 1-p. 62, l. 31; p. 64, l. 19-p. 65, l. 24). The selections, it will be observed, contain none of the comic scenes, and from them Lamb has excised the comic lines of Montenegro, Sforza, and Diego. But the passages include scenes important to the forwarding of the story and also the best verse in the play.[35] Moreover, Lamb gave us a poet's selection from the play and a poet's interpretation of many lines of the text. His editorial principles were sound; his relining of

---

[33]Israel Gollancz (ed.), Charles Lamb's specimens of English dramatic poets. . . . (London: Dent, 1893), II, 206-215.

[34]Lucas, IV, 373-382.

[35]Some other lines in the play are perhaps equal to those selected, but they are found neither in such large blocks nor in scenes so dramatically important or so easily separable as those that Lamb chose.

some of the verse, his punctuation, his verbal changes are seldom false, and always interesting. For this reason I have included in the collation notes a number of Lamb's readings. These I have selected on the same basis as those by Gifford, but because of Gifford's greater editorial labors, I have not recorded those readings of Lamb also found in Gifford.

The opinions of Gollancz and Lucas on the reading of the text I have considered of such weight that I have also recorded in the collation notes any reading in which they differ from Gifford or Lamb or both. It is true that Gollancz followed Gifford in a rather thorough modernization of spelling and punctuation and that Lucas purposed to reproduce the original text of Lamb, but sometimes these two scholars give their imprimaturs to a questionable reading by Gifford or some new interpretation of the text. In such cases I have recorded their readings.

5. The Present Edition.

Principles of transcription.--The emphasis in this, the tercentenary edition of The maid's revenge, is primarily bibliological. In transcribing the text of the University of Chicago copy, I have been guided by one principle above all: I have reproduced the reading of the quarto as exactly as possible on a modern typewriter. That is to say, although the quarto uses a v in some cases where we should have a u, I have kept the v, but I have recorded all long s's as s, because of the limitations of such a machine. Likewise, I have indicated the presence of ornaments, large capitals, and the like, but I have not reproduced them. I have used the convention of underlining to indicate italics and that of underlining twice to indicate a font of type (whether italic or capital) larger than that of the letters in the same line; but even on the same page, a letter, underscored twice,

may not be of the same size in the quarto as another letter so underscored.

In the matter of spacing, since the exactly regular spacing of the typewriter can never be made to approximate the flexible spacing of movable type, I have followed certain arbitrary principles, the sole virtue of which is that they are carried out with complete uniformity. Especially in the matter of spacing before and after punctuation is arbitrariness necessary. It might be of bibliological interest, for example, to notice that Cotes in general placed his colons midway between the words that they separate; but since his practice is not consistent in respect to colons, since at times the practice seems also to apply to commas, periods, and other marks of punctuation, and since such spacing appears to follow oftener the exigencies of typographical justification than any decided practice, I have consistently followed modern practice of spacing with punctuation. In the spacing between words, I have not run two words together (especially in a crowded line of the quarto) unless the words appear at first sight and at repeated readings to be one. It is likewise impossible to tell always whether 'an other' or 'another,' for example, is meant; in an uncrowded line, I have considered as two words groups of letters separated by an en. Doubtful cases I have noticed in the collation notes at the foot of each page. The spacing of lines of type on the page has also required arbitrary principles. When lines are not flush with the left-hand margin but are close to it, I have been guided by the number of letters in a line above or below that is flush with the margin. When words or phrases are flush with or near to the right-hand margin but are not part of lines begun at the left-hand margin, I have made them flush with the right-hand margin. For lines centered in the quarto, I have put the first

letter above or below the letter below or above it on the quarto page, choosing that letter which most nearly produces the impression of the quarto.

Turned letters (like n and u) I have reproduced by their nearest equivalents on the typewriter (for a turned n I have written u). When there is no near equivalent (as for a turned i), I have simply noticed the error in the collation notes. Since it is impossible to determine always with certainty the tops of s's (lower case or capital), I have recorded no instances of what appears to be a turned s.

I have occasionally commented in the collation notes on instances of bad type, insufficient inking, or other damage, but only in those cases which might lead to confusion on the part of a reader comparing a copy with such damage with my text or even with other copies of the quarto. Doubtful readings in those copies which I have examined only in microfilm I have seldom recorded because of my uncertainty whether the book itself or the microfilm is at fault.

I have usually ignored the doubt arising from Cotes's commas that look like full stops (or the contrary) because they are small types.[36] I have also ignored the peculiar e's,[37] as having no significance for the text; they were merely in the box, and the compositor disregarded their earlier function.

Inasmuch as the text is reproduced as a bibliological entity, I have numbered its pages from one to sixty-eight, commencing with the title-page; the play proper then begins on page five. I have also adopted a system of line-numbering which counts any line of type, whether stage-direction, running-head, rule, or ornament. This system, I am aware, is open to the charges of being

---

[36] See p. vi. [37] Ibid.

pedantic and eccentric. For the first, I plead that it is exact. For the second, I plead that because it has proved eminently convenient to me and because to number only the lines intended to be spoken on a typographical basis would confuse two methods, my system is an experiment, the results of which can be obtained only from criticism from my readers. To facilitate reference to the play, heretofore usually given from Gifford's edition, I have given the act and scene number in the right-hand margin of my page.

The collation notes.--In the collation notes at the foot of each page, I have recorded all variants in the ten copies of the quarto text which I have examined.[38] I have also recorded significant departures in 1793 and in Gifford[39] from the text of the quarto. Such departures I consider significant when they alter the sense of a passage, clarify the intention of the quarto, or enable me to choose among the various possible interpretations of the quarto, or even when the intended meaning in 1793 or Gifford is doubtful. Thus, I have recorded all changes in wording (except those in stage-directions which do not alter the sense). For 1793 such verbal changes include many "corrections" (whether acceptable or not) and a few cryptic readings, which, even though they are most probably misprints, may be thought attempts at emendation. For Gifford, such changes include his silent emendations, his alterations for which he gives the reading of the "old copy" in a footnote, and his bracketed additions in the text. Since my collation notes reproduce Gifford's brackets in such emendations, and since I always give in the Notes (pp. 69-106) Gifford's footnotes on conjectural readings, all of his changes are to be considered

---

[38]For a list of these, see p. xxi; and for exceptions to this principle, see p.

[39]I have not considered profitable a collation of copies of 1793 or of Gifford.

silent unless there is some indication to the contrary. For Lamb and his subsequent editors, I have recorded only those changes in the text which no other editions contain. And since Gifford's edition is the only one with any claim to authority, I have used the convention 'Gifford &c' to indicate a reading in Gifford with which 1793, the various editions of Lamb, or any combination thereof substantially agree. The reading so given is Gifford's, and the others may differ slightly in spelling or punctuation.

Although many of the collation notes record differences among the various editions in spelling and capitalization of words, no note has been included merely for the purpose of recording such a difference unless the respelling can be construed as resulting in a possible difference in sense or as correcting an error in Q, or unless in the case of the expansion of a contraction (or the contrary) such a change affects radically the meter of the line. On rare occasions I have recorded also a modernized spelling in Gifford if it affords a short-cut to the understanding of the text.

Changes in punctuation I have recorded only when they alter what I consider the intention of the quarto, when they indicate a choice between possible meanings, and when they give a significant interpretation of the meaning or make clear a grammatical structure not readily apparent to a reader fairly familiar with Jacobean systems of punctuation.

Finally, I have recorded all divergences from the quarto in 1793, Gifford, and Lamb and his editors when there is a change from verse to prose or from prose to verse. Even where we may feel sure that what the quarto prints is intended as prose, I have considered any two successive lines beginning with capital letters to require the comment 'Gifford prints as prose,' if such is the case. If it is impossible to determine the intention of the quarto, I have indicated the dilemma.

Judgments concerning the value of emendations I have tried to make sparingly. In those cases where the superiority of the reading of the quarto is obvious to a reader of Jacobean plays, I have indicated in the collation notes that the emendation is made 'unnecessarily.' When fuller discussion is necessary (e. g., when Gifford's alteration is not obvious, not wholly or necessarily justifiable, not clearly helpful, or not acceptable) I have referred by an asterisk to such further discussion in the Notes (pp. 69 ff.).

Every entry in the collation notes begins with the line number or numbers of the reading in question. This is followed by the reading of the text; if several words are involved, I have given but the first and last word of the passage separated by four dots. This reading is separated from what follows by a bracket (]). When the note has been made to indicate a variant reading, this reading follows the bracket; this in turn is followed by an indication of the source of that variant. All copies of the quarto not mentioned are to be considered as having the reading of the basic text (the University of Chicago copy). If the edition by Gifford or the text of 1793 is not specifically mentioned, it is to be considered as agreeing substantially with that quarto. If there is more than one variant, the second is separated from the first by a semicolon. Hence the note:

> 34 to maintaine honour and stemme] to maintain honor and esteem 1793; maintain th'honour and [keep the] stem Gifford*

This note means: "The words on line 34 from 'to' through 'stemme' (which all copies of the quarto have) are printed as 'to maintain honor and esteem' in the edition of 1793, and as 'maintain th' honour and [keep the] stem' (even to the brackets) in the edition by Gifford; there is a comment on these readings in the Notes." When the note has been included for the purpose of comment, instead

of for the purpose of presenting variants, the bracket is followed by a statement.

Symbols in the collation notes and their meanings are:

The copies of the quarto (the items starred I have examined in microfilm)

Q	all the copies of the quarto which I have examined
C	the copy of the quarto in The University of Chicago
Ca	" " " " " " my possession
CN	" " " " " " The Newberry Library, Chicago
H*	" " " " " " Harvard University
Hn	" " " " " " Henry Huntington Library, San Marino, California
LC*	" " " " " " The Library of Congress
Y*	" " " " " " Yale University
Bo*	" " " " " " The Bodleian Library
D	" " " " " " The Dyce Collection in The Victoria and Albert Museum
W	" " " " " " The British Museum, formerly in the collection of T. J. Wise

Later editions

1793 The edition published as a supplement to The Thespian magazine or literary repository (see pp. ix-xi.)

Gifford The six-volume edition of Shirley published in 1833 by William Gifford and Alexander Dyce (see pp. xi-xiv)

Gifford &c A reading in Gifford with which 1793, the various editions of Lamb, or combinations thereof agree

Lamb The editions of 1808, 1813, and 1835 of Charles Lamb's Specimens of English Dramatic poets (see pp. xiv-xvi)

Gollancz The edition of Lamb's Specimens by Israel Gollancz (see p. xvi)

Lucas The edition of Lamb's Specimens in E. V. Lucas's edition of The complete works of Charles Lamb (see p. xvi)

Carpenter Manuscript notes in the copy of Gifford formerly owned by the late Professor Frederic Ives Carpenter (see Appendix C)

Emendation A reading which I have thought suitable

Other symbols

....	Omissions made by me from any of the texts dealt with
*	A direction to a fuller discussion in the notes
[]	An addition to the text by me, unless it is in a variant noted as by Gifford, in which case it is his addition

Other conventions are the same as those used in the transcription of the text (see pp. xvi-xxi).

The notes.--In the Notes (pp. 69 ff.) I have given Lamb's summaries of the action, and because his selections are indicative of his critical attitude toward the play, I have indicated where they end, the presence of a summary indicating where they begin. Also included are Gifford's footnotes. And finally there are comments on the collation notes, bibliological explanations concerning the material in the front matter of the quarto, observations on the various editions, and elucidation of words, punctuation, and grammatical constructions in the text.

B. The Writing of The Play

1. The Date of Composition.

We can place the writing of The maid's revenge certainly within a period of roughly three years. Unless we assume that Shirley saw Reynolds's tale in manuscript, we have the publication of the second book of The triumphs of God's revenge (the source of Shirley's play) as the terminus a quo. This work was entered on the Stationers' Register on the seventh of June, 1621, and the title-page of the second book bears the date 1622. A later date is suggested by the licensing of Love tricks, 11 February, 1624/5, because this play, its prologue tells us, was

> The first fruits of a Muse, that before this
> Never saluted audience. . . .
> . . . . . .
> Though he employ some hours, he only prays
> You take it as first-born. . . .
> . . . . . .
> Accept then a beginning: all men know,
> He first kiss'd bays, that wore them on his brow.[40]

The maid's revenge, then, must have followed Love tricks, dated roughly by the license. And between the writing of these two plays may have come the composition of The tragedy of St. Albans. This play, I believe, came before The maid's revenge.[41] Whether it came before or after Love tricks is not certain, for the words of the prologue may mean that Love tricks was Shirley's first play to be produced.[42] But, on the basis of the prologue, I hold it likely that St. Albans, though it may have been begun before Love tricks,[43] was not finished until after it. The maid's revenge was entered on Sir Henry Herbert's office book on the ninth of February,

---

[40] Gifford, I, [5]. [41] See note on p. 3, ll. 10-11.

[42] So far as we know, St. Albans was never produced nor published.

[43] That Shirley began it while at St. Albans seems probable.

1625/6, by which time we may suppose it was complete, or nearly so. The play was written, then, in or near a period of roughly a year, from the eleventh of February, 1624/5, to the ninth of the following February, and perhaps late in that period.

2. The Source.

As early as 1691 Langbaine mentioned as the source of The maid's revenge "Antonio and Berinthia," the seventh history of the second book of The triumphs of God's revenge against.... murder by John Reynolds.[44] The first book[45] of this collection of moral tales was published in 1621.[46] The second book followed in 1622 with the title-page:

[within a double rule] THE / TRIVMPHS / OF GODS REVENGE,

---

[44]Gerard Langbaine, An account of the English dramatick poets.... (Oxford: L. L. for George West and Henry Clements, 1691), p. 481.

[45]STC 20942: "The triumphs of Gods revenege (sic) ag. the crying a. execrable sinne of murther.....Ent. 7 jn 1621."

[46]Reynolds's life is difficult to trace for two reasons: records at hand are few; in available works he is frequently confused with another (or even others) of the same name. He was born in Exeter, as the dedication of the fifth book of The triumphs to the Earl of Bedford and the title-page of The flower of fidelity (1655) tell us, and was a merchant (cf. The flower of fidelity, title-page). The dedication of that book to his father-in-law makes clear that he married the daughter of Richard Waltham, Justice of the Peace and Quorum in the County of Devon. It also reveals that this work was "the first April-fruits of....[his] cerebrosities extraction." He traveled in France, where he met Lord Strange, to whom he dedicated the sixth book of The triumphs (cf. that dedication and the "Readvertisement to the Christian reader" in the 1634-5 edition of The triumphs). He translated "a Worke of Monsieur de Refuges, Intituled A treatise of the Court" (cf. the epistle dedicatory to King Charles of The triumphs). If we can trust the implications and the facts in his various dedications, he was on friendly terms with some of the greatest and most influential men of the century. Indeed, in the dedication of the third book of The triumphs to the Lord Chamberlain, he says that his "two former Bookes....have not only been approved, but applauded" by the King himself. His literary work is confined to the second and third decades of the seventeenth century. Several other works besides those I have mentioned have been attributed to this John Reynolds, but these I have been unable to examine. For further information, though sometimes confusing, cf. DNB, "John Reynolds."

/ AGAINST THE CRYING / and execrable sinne of / Murther, / In thirty seuerall Tragicall Histories, / (digested into six Books) committed in di- / uers Countryes beyond the Seas, and / neuer before published or imprin- / ted in any Language. / [rule] / Written by IOHN REYNOLDS / [rule] / BOOKE II. / [rule] / [ornament] / AT LONDON, / Imprinted by Felix KYNGSTON, / for William Lee, and are to be sold at his shop / in Fleet-Street, at the signe of the golden / Buck, neere Seriants Inne. / 1622.

The third book followed in 1624. Another edition, with a new printer, (STC 20943) came in 1629; and in 1634 and 1635 six books were collected under one title-page; this was reissued in 1639,[47] and a second edition appeared the following year. By 1669 it had gone through six editions, and in 1667 it was translated into Dutch. In 1685 Thomas Wright took over some of the stories for his The glory of God's revenge. The popularity of Reynolds's tales lasted on, and they appeared in various redactions in 1704 and as late as 1770. These stories belonged, apparently, to a popular kind of writing which included Thomas Beard's The theatre of Gods judgements: or, a collection of histories (1597, 1612 [augmented], 1631), Edmund Rudierd's The thunderbolt of Gods wrath, or an abridgement of Gods fearefull judgements (1618).

Reynolds's serious moral purpose, so serious in fact that at times the modern reader of the tales thinks that he protests too much, is evident in his "Readvertisement to the Christian reader" of the edition of 1634-5:

> I have consecrated my Pen rather to Instruction then Eloquence, and to Charity rather then Curiosity, and have made it my chiefest Care, Ambition, and Conscience, to profit thy soule, rather then to please thine Eare.[48]

Reynolds may never be eloquent; he is prolix. He is too avid a lover of justice to be wholly charitable. But his curiosity,

---

[47]The STC (20944) calls this another edition, but the edition of 1640 is called the second.

[48]John Reynolds, The triumphs of Gods revenge. . . . (2d ed.; London: for William Lee, 1635), sig. [A6]v.

evident in his delight in the minutiae of private lives, is unbounded. This curiosity led him to collect some excellent stories. Of the manner of collecting these stories, Reynolds says:

> I understand there are a generation of people, who have beene so strangely ignorant, as to give out that these my Histories are not Originalls, but Translations, either from Italian or French; all which (with equall Truth and Modesty) I firmely contradict and deny, whether they regard Matter, Manner, or Method, or Phrase, Place, or Persons; for contrariwise I found out the grounds of them in my Travells, and (at mine owne leisure) composed and penned them, according to the rule of my weake Fancie and Capacity, they being so farre from Translations, that as I have hitherto refused to imitate any therein, but myselfe, so had I beene so ambitious or vaineglorious to have given way, or consent to it, some Friends of mine in Paris, had long since done the three first Bookes into French. . . . .I have hitherto prevented it, and doe still resolve so to doe.[49]

But though he prevented a translation into French, he could not prevent the metamorphosis that Middleton and Rowley worked in one of his tales which they used as the source of The changeling nor that which Shirley worked in The maid's revenge.[50]

In many respects the stories in Reynolds and in Shirley are alike, not only in the major events, but in trifling details. These I have reconstructed into the following account of the story as told by both.[51]

> Antonio, a noble young man, and Sebastiano, son of Vilarezo, are great friends (pp. 5-6, 25-6; p. 48) who have spent time in Lisbon together (p. 5; p. 48). Sebastiano, in order to cement their friendship, offers one of his sisters in marriage to Antonio (p. 6; p. 48) and invites him to their house in Avero to that end (p. 6; p. 48), promising to second him in the design (p. 7; p. 48). The rich and noble Vilarezo (p. 53; p. 46), father to Sebastiano, has two daughters, Catalina and Berinthia, alike beautiful and virtuous (p. 6; p. 47), whose future much concerns him (p. 7; p. 47); they are

---

[49] Ibid., sigs. [A5]^{v}-[A6]^{r}.

[50] I have often thought that Shirley might have been prompted to use Reynolds by the success of Middleton and Rowley.

[51] In this account the parentheses enclose, first, the page numbers in The maid's revenge and, second, the page numbers in "Antonio and Berinthia," the text of which I give in Appendix A.

sought by many suitors, among them noblemen (pp. 7, 8; p. 47). Antonio, perceiving the great honor to be derived from such a match (pp. 6-7; p. 48), comes to Avero (p. 11; p. 48), where he is welcomed by Vilarezo for his own honor and Sebastiano's report of him (p. 11; p. 48). Antonio, though he cannot dislike Catalina, who is imperious and ambitious (p. 12; pp. 47, 48), falls in love with Berinthia instantly (p. 12; p. 48) and would be her servant (p. 12; p. 48); he is especially taken with her piercing eye and blushing cheek (p. 14; p. 48). Berinthia, for her part, loves him (p. 15; p. 49), but she cannot grant his suit (p. 18; p. 49); her father must marry off Catalina first (p. 14; p. 49); nor is Antonio more successful in gaining the father's permission to marry Berinthia (p. 14; p. 49). Catalina has conceived as strong a passion for Antonio as his for Berinthia (pp. 17, 19; p. 50). Antonio is accordingly forced to woo Berinthia stealthily and pretend affection for Catalina (p. 19; p. 50). But Antonio is called away (p. 20; p. 51) and takes leave with much courtesy (p. 20; pp. 51, 52).

While Antonio is away, he communicates with Berinthia by letter (p. 28; p. 54); such a letter is borne by Diego, his page, who feigns love to Catalina's maid, Ansilva, as an excuse for coming to Avero (pp. 21, 28; p. 54). Berinthia is overjoyed to hear from Antonio (p. 29; p. 54). But a letter falls into Catalina's hands (p. 30; pp. 60-1). Berinthia, suffering under her father's displeasure, is kept locked up (p. 27; p. 61). Catalina, mad with jealousy, resolves to poison her sister (p. 32; p. 62); but Diego discovers the plot (p. 32; pp. 62-3) and reveals it to Berinthia (p. 33; p. 64) and hastens to his master at Elvas (p. 34; p. 64). Berinthia, thus warned, avoids the poison, yet tricks Ansilva into thinking that she has taken it (p. 42; p. 69); this news Ansilva reports to Catalina (p. 42; p. 69).

At midnight (p. 32; p. 67), Antonio, guided by a candle in the window (p. 32; p. 67) and accompanied by friends (p. 42; p. 67) steals Berinthia away (p. 42; pp. 69-71). Her absence discovered (p. 44; p. 72), Antonio is suspected because Diego is also missing (p. 45; p. 72). Vilarezo is furious at such an affront (p. 45; p. 72), but because his age prevents him (p. 45; p. 72), he sends Sebastiano to bring her back (p. 45; p. 72). Sebastiano goes willingly to rescue his sister (p. 46; p. 73). Arrived at Elvas Castle (p. 48; p. 73), Sebastiano accuses Antonio of disloyalty and dishonor (p. 49; p. 73); he will have her back or, he says, leave his life at Elvas (p. 52; p. 78). They tell him of the attempted poisoning at home (p. 51; pp. 73-4). Berinthia assures him of her safety (p. 52; p. 75). Sebastiano agrees, after consultation with his friends (p. 52; p. 75), and sends one of them home for advice (p. 53; p. 75). Vilarezo, upon hearing the news, examines Catalina and believes her guiltless (p. 55; pp. 75-6); he sends a letter with a new command to Sebastiano to bring Berinthia home (pp. 56-7; p. 76). Sebastiano once more challenges Antonio (p. 57; p. 78). Antonio fights with him (pp. 58-9; pp. 79 ff.), not telling Berinthia of his resolve (p. 58; p. 79); Antonio and his second are killed (p. 59; pp. 79, 80). Berinthia is grief stricken (p. 59; pp. 80-1).

She resolves to get revenge (pp. 62-3; p. 87). Accordingly, she stabs Sebastiano while he and his page sleep (p. 65; p. 88). Berinthia pays with her death (p. 67; p. 94).

Catalina (p. 67; p. 84) and Ansilva (p. 66; p. 77) also meet death on account of their sins.

The foregoing account, because it gives only those details found in both Reynolds and Shirley, does justice to neither. It leaves out all the elements of the story that Shirley omits in the play. Of greatest significance, of course, is his neglecting of the moral--the very raison d'être of Reynolds's tale (cf., for example, the title; the long introduction, pp. 44-6; the disquisition on Catalina's and Sarmiata's deaths, pp. 84-6; the story of Berinthia's trial and death, pp. 91-4). Besides this alteration there are many aspects of the story itself, both threads of plot and details, which Shirley ignores. Reynolds tells us, for instance, that Sebastiano is fifteen years old and a page at Court (p. 46) and that Antonio is first gentleman to the Duke of Bragansa (p. 48). And Shirley omits all mention of Alphanta, Vilarezo's wife, whom Reynolds describes fully (p. 46), and who takes part in the refusal of Berinthia to Antonio (p. 52) and in the lamentations at the end (e. g., pp. 90, 91, 93). Nor does Shirley include Antonio's second and third attempts to get Vilarezo's consent to the marriage of his daughter (pp. 50, 52), Antonio's grief at Vilarezo's refusal (pp. 50-1), Vilarezo's urging Antonio to take Catalina (pp. 49, 52), Sebastiano's sorrow that Antonio does not choose his older sister (p. 53), nor the exchange of tokens between Antonio and Berinthia (p. 51) and their touching farewells (p. 51).

Shirley again condenses the story through omission of details after Antonio's departure from Avero. Thus he leaves out two of the letters entirely and the texts of all of them, which Reynolds gives (pp. 44-5, 56, 59), the attendant orgies of sentiment on the part of both the recipients (pp. 55, 57), and the exchange of tokens between the lovers: the opals (p. 56) and the

bracelets and pearls (p. 58). Shirley also cuts down Reynolds's account of Catalina's passion: her disappointment at not having letters from Antonio (pp. 55, 60) and her request that her father write to him asking his intentions (p. 60). With Shirley's change in the source of Vilarezo's displeasure at Berinthia, he of necessity omits Vilarezo's considering denying Antonio and Diego welcome at Avero (p. 61); and with the change in Diego's discovery of Catalina's poisoning plot, he omits the whole incident of the galley-pot (pp. 62-4). The action after Diego's discovery is also hastened: the letters are omitted (pp. 66, 67), as are Diego's trip and his pretext for leaving (pp. 65 ff.), Berinthia's preparations (p. 68), the details of the circumvention of Catalina's poison and the killing of the parrot (pp. 68-70), and the escape through the city gates (pp. 70-71).

Of the remaining action, Shirley omits the text of the two letters and similar details of the rescue of Berinthia (pp. 75-9), Sebastiano's decision to use arms and not law (p. 78), the arrest of Sebastiano and his second (p. 80), Catalina's confession to Berinthia (p. 82), Catalina's violent death and confession (pp. 83 ff.), Sarmiata's (i. e., Sharkino's) apprehension and punishment (pp. 84 ff.), many details of Berinthia's crime, including, for example, the lute (p. 88) and Philippo's discovery (p. 89), and, of course, Berinthia's whole fate thereafter (pp. 89-94).

In addition to these omissions, Shirley makes many alterations in the details of the story. Thus in Reynolds, Sebastiano offers Antonio only his elder sister, Catalina, and not either of two (p. 6; p. 48), and apparently for good reason: Catalina is made far less attractive (p. 12; p. 47). Further, Vilarezo's decision is no mere whim (as in Shirley, p. 14) but a resolution

based on his belief that Catalina is far more worthy (p. 49). The leave-taking reveals other changes: Shirley's is far less elaborate than Reynolds's; discretion (not his sister, as in the play) calls Antonio from Avero (p. 20; p. 51); he goes to Lisbon, not to Elvas (pp. 19-20; p. 51); and the manner of Diego's suit to Ansilva is altered: in the play he carries out Antonio's directions, before the departure, to ask leave to visit her (p. 21), and in the novel the plot is forwarded after the return to Elvas (p. 54).

Moreover, Catalina's discovery of the love of Antonio for Berinthia is much earlier in Shirley; she suspects it even before he leaves (p. 15) and acts before the discovery of the letter (p. 23), whereas in the novel not until Antonio has written to Berinthia does she set Ansilva to question Diego (p. 60), and not until the discovery of the letter does she forward any plot against Berinthia (pp. 60-1). And it is a second letter, not the first, that Catalina discovers (p. 30; pp. 54-5, 59). In the arrangements for this correspondence made before Antonio's leaving Avero, and not after (p. 21; pp. 53-4), Shirley makes another change. There is a further change in the time of Berinthia's confinement, which comes, through the Valasco plot (p. 27), before the discovery of the letter and not after Catalina has shown Antonio's letter to her father as in Reynolds (p. 61). And the discovery itself is different: in the play Berinthia accidentally drops the letter (p. 29), whereas in the novel Catalina finds it in the pocket of her sister's dress (pp. 60-1).

More of Shirley's changes deal with the poisoning plot; Sharkino (Reynolds's Sarmiata) appears in connection with it from the first (p. 35) and not after the abduction (pp. 77, 83 ff.). Diego discovers the plot through overhearing Catalina (pp. 29-32),

and not through the accident which forces Ansilva's confession as in the novel (pp. 62-3). And in Shirley's condensation of the time, Diego goes directly to Elvas for Antonio (p. 34), and does not take a letter from Berinthia (pp. 65-6) and return with a reply (pp. 66-7). This leads to another change: Berinthia does not recognize her abductor in Shirley (p. 42), whereas in the tale she makes elaborate preparations for his coming (pp. 68-70), including the poisoning of Catalina's parrot, which in turn leads to Catalina's discovery that Berinthia is not poisoned (Reynolds, by implication, pp. 71-2) as against her surety of her sister's death in Shirley (p. 46). Both Antonio's and Berinthia's plans for the abduction, too, (again because of Shirley's addition of the Valasco plot) must be more elaborate in Reynolds (p. 42; pp. 66 ff.). Shirley saves time also in the discovery of the abduction immediately (p. 43) and not the next morning (p. 71).

In the events connected with the duel, we find similar changes. Thus Shirley's Villandras is Belasco in Reynolds (p. 79), and for Sebastiano's cousin (p. 75), Villandras, Shirley substitutes Montenegro and Valasco. Villandras goes to Avero (p. 75) and fights in the duel (p. 80). Hence, at Avero the situation differs: Vilarezo examines Catalina separately (p. 75), and not Catalina and Valasco, as in Shirley (p. 55). And at Elvas, Sebastiano is on less friendly terms with Antonio than in Shirley's play: he stays without the castle gates and writes his challenge (p. 57; pp. 73-8). Accordingly, the duel in the play has more tragic implications, especially since Vilarezo's order is to kill (p. 56) and not simply to regain Berinthia by law or by sword (p. 76). Shirley's duel takes place in the castle (p. 58) and not, as in the novel, on the meadow before it (p. 78), and with the ladies present, and not, as in Reynolds, with them at home (pp.

58-9; p. 80). In it the seconds do not fight (in Reynolds) until after Antonio's death (pp. 58-9; p. 80), and Sebastiano's second is not killed (p. 59; p. 80).

And in the later events, Shirley makes numerous changes. In Reynolds, for example, there is no honourable capitulation; Sebastiano must break into the castle with the militia (p. 59; p. 81). Further, when Berinthia kills her brother, she slits his throat (p. 88) so that he cannot deliver a death speech such as Shirley gives him (p. 65), nor does she exult in her deed, but tries to hide it (pp. 88-92). Nor is she responsible for the deaths of Catalina and Ansilva (pp. 66-7); in the novel Catalina is struck by lightning (p. 83) for her poisoning of Ansilva much earlier (p. 77). And finally, Berinthia's death is not self-inflicted as in Shirley (p. 66), but decreed by law (pp. 93-4).

What, then, does Shirley add? The story, as I have given it above, is certainly disconnected; the omissions that I have also pointed out seem to rob the play of interest and cohesion; and for many of the alterations listed there seems little justification. But the additions fill out the story thus disjointed. In the first place, Shirley elaborates on the suitors: Valasco and Montenegro are made definite characters, and have vital functions in furthering the story. Around Valasco (whose name only seems to have been suggested by Belasco of the tale) are centered several threads of plot: through him Berinthia is locked up (pp. 24, 26-7), through him the kidnapping plot is expedited (pp. 24, 30-32), through him Berinthia's escape is early discovered (p. 43), and through him Vilarezo's belief in Berinthia's guilt and his resultant wrath are increased (pp. 55-6), and the duel is forwarded (pp. 57-8). Montenegro, for his part, is necessary to the story in making clear the implications of Vilarezo's resolution (pp.

14-15), in persuading Sebastiano to send home for advice (p. 52), in betraying to Catalina the accusations against her (p. 55), and in providing the love-powder, the vehicle whereby Berinthia poisons Catalina and Ansilva (pp. 63-6).

Indeed, the greatest part of the comedy centers about Montenegro: Catalina's showing up his false valor with her dream (p. 8), his bad verses (p. 10), his cowardice in affronting Antonio (p. 15), his insults (aside) to Antonio (pp. 20-22), his scene with Sharkino (pp. 35-7) and the episode with the servingmen, and his subsequent desire to be taken down (pp. 39-41), his diarrhoea (pp. 44-5), his false valor (pp. 50-52) and his cowardice at Elvas (p. 58), his succumbing to Ansilva's charms for the want of a better (pp. 63-4), and his final asinine courtship of Castabella (p. 68).

The rest of the comedy Shirley supplies in Sharkino and Scarabeo--those descendants of Jonson's Subtle and Face—(pp. 34-5), in Sforza (pp. 46-9, 51, 53, 57)[52] and in Ansilva and Diego. Diego--the witty page (pp. 17-18) and the young man making love to the older woman (pp. 18, 28-9)--and Ansilva--his vis-à-vis, an actor in the scene in Sharkino's study (pp. 34-5), and the object of the Count's foolish love (pp. 63-4)--add to the comedy. Like Montenegro and Valasco, they are instrumental in forwarding the story. Although Shirley gives Diego no greater part than does Reynolds in the complication of the plot, Ansilva's role is enlarged: to her, Catalina reveals her love for Antonio (pp. 16-17), and through her, the resolution of Berinthia's revenge on Catalina and the Count's foolish love is effected (pp. 63-4, 65, 66-7).

Finally, the masque (p. 57) and the whole story of Castabella are Shirley's additions. Castabella is introduced early

---

[52]Forsythe (p. 137) thinks that "Sforza, a 'blunt soldier,' is the Belasco of the tale more definitely characterized."

(p. 18). She gives Antonio an audience for the revelation of his great friendship for Sebastiano (pp. 25-6). Later she entertains Berinthia (pp. 46 ff.). Finally, the tragedy of her love for Sebastiano adds much to the approaching catastrophe (pp. 52, 53, 57-9, 60-62, 64-5, 66-8).

Such changes by Shirley arise, I believe, from the requirements of his medium. His neglect of the moral and the incidents illustrative of it (for example, the deaths of Catalina and Berinthia and the episode of Sarmiata) is necessitated by the fact that he was writing a tragedy, not a moral thesis. Such a comparison as I have made shows also the ways in which Shirley heightens the tragic effect. There is a closer relationship between the actors of the tragic incidents: a closer relationship between Antonio and Sebastiano, not only through a more fervent friendship, but also through the tie of the love of Castabella and Sebastiano. Shirley also effects such a heightening through having Catalina meet her death at the hands of her sister and through having Berinthia die by her own hand, not through an agent outside of the tragedy proper.

Shirley's changes also come from the necessity of telling the story within the scope of the drama. He telescopes incidents (for example, Diego's discovery and Antonio's attempts to persuade her father), and he omits incidents not directly concerned with forwarding the story (for example, Alphanta, the parrot, and the arrest of Sebastiano and Villandras).

In short, Shirley's treatment of Reynolds's story is akin to, if not so great as, Shakespeare's handling of Brooke's tale in Romeo and Juliet.[53]

---

[53]In the development of his play, Shirley uses a number of themes, creates many incidents, draws several characters, which have many parallels in Tudor and Stuart drama. Forsythe has noticed such similarities (cf. especially, pp. 98-9, 101-2, 112-13,